

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 6-22 are active in this application. Support for these claims is found in Claims 1-5 and the specification as originally filed. No new matter is added by these amendments.

As amended herein the claims are directed to a method of treating glaucoma, by administering to an eye in need thereof at least one compound of formula I, enantiomers and salts thereof. This method is not described in the publications cited by the Examiner.

GB 123410 describes 1,2,3,4-tetrahydronaphthalene derivatives that have sympathomimetic activity (page 1, line 35 of GB '410). This publication also suggests their potential application for conditions such as bronchial asthma, broncho-obstructive states, in general, and others (see page 1, lines 37-41 of GB '410).

WO 96/29065 describes aminotetralin derivatives (see page 3, fourth paragraph with reference to GB '410) useful for the treatment of cardiac disorders (page 1, first paragraph).

However, neither of these publications describe employing at least one compound of formula I in a method of treating glaucoma as presently claimed. As a result the present claims are not anticipated by these publications and as such withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is requested.

The Examiner also makes reference to U.S. Patent No. 5,314,916 but does not appear to reject the claims over this reference. Nonetheless, the present invention is not anticipated by or rendered obvious by this publication. U.S. '916 describes compounds having an aminotetralin structure with β_2 agonistic activity which may also be used to treat glaucoma. However, the compounds in U.S. '916 are different than the compounds employed in the present claim which act on α_2 adrenergic and DA_2 dopaminergic receptors. As described in the specification on pages 4-5 compounds of formula I significantly decrease the intraocular pressure (IOP) and have better characteristics in terms of chemical stability and ocular bioavailability (see page 5, lines 19-20). Applicants also direct the Examiner's attention to

the last paragraph on page 9 which also describes that the compounds of formula I while being effective did not cause significant eye irritation. Furthermore, since the compounds have a different mechanism of action they are able to facilitate the treatment of glaucoma while not stimulating β_2 adrenergic receptors which are a basis for exerting side effects in the cardiovascular system.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. § 101 are obviated by the cancellation of those claims.

Finally, Applicants request that the Examiner acknowledge and return the PTO Form 1449 submitted to the Office on May 30, 2003 as evidence of his consideration of the patent publications listed therein. A copy of this PTO Form 1449 is attached for the Examiner's convenience.

Applicants also request that this application now be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Customer Number

22850

Daniel J. Pereira, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,518